

COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

Public Involvement Efforts are summarized in the Public Involvement section beginning on page 168. The written public comments were voluminous and so have been summarized beginning on page 175.

Copies of pertinent correspondence between WisDOT and the cooperating agency (USACE) and other agencies are presented in Appendix B.

The initial agency and public scoping meetings were held on October 10, 2002. The project followed the concurrent Section 404 permit NEPA process which requests agencies to concur at various milestones in the EIS preparation. The first milestone was project purpose and need. A meeting with the agencies to discuss the purpose and need was held on May 28, 2003. The second milestone was the selection of alternatives to be studied in detail in the DEIS. A meeting was held to discuss the alternatives to be carried forward on September 25, 2003. The third milestone will be when WisDOT selects a preferred alternative, after the circulation of the Draft EIS for public and agency comment. See the Basic Sheets on page 166 for a summary of Agency Coordination.

Meetings with community groups and individuals were held throughout the Environmental Impact Study and the Needs Assessment Study. The goal and intent of the public involvement program was to gather public opinion, obtain advice from local authorities, and to encourage involvement of all groups within the population. These groups included those populations that traditionally do not get involved such as low-income groups and minority groups. WisDOT's policy is to implement public involvement processes with a collaborative, interdisciplinary approach in which stakeholders are part of the planning and design process.

With information gathered through the public involvement program, WisDOT hopes to plan and design a transportation facility that provides safety and mobility while fitting into the physical, cultural, social, and environmental setting of the adjacent communities. WisDOT will use the information gathered from their public involvement efforts in future design of the facilities of the selected alternative. To this end, flexibility is provided for in the current design standards and policies and can be incorporated into a future US 12 project. Even in the preliminary design of the alternatives community sensitive design has occurred through the alignment of the alternatives to avoid the greatest amount of wetlands, historic sites, parks, relocations, farm severances, and farms. The factor sheets document opportunities for further avoidance through design. Commitments to Community Sensitive Design related actions would be recorded for the selected alternative in the Final EIS Environmental Commitments section on page 164.

A. AGENCY COORDINATION

1) Intra-Agency Coordination

a) Bureau of Aeronautics

- ☐ **No - Coordination is not required. Project is not located within 2 miles (3.22 kilometers) of a public or military use airport nor would the project change the horizontal or vertical alignment of a transportation facility located within 6.44 kilometers (4 miles) of a public use or military airport.**
- ☒ **Yes - Coordination has been completed and project effects have been addressed. Explain:**

The Bureau of Aeronautics was contacted for input regarding Fort Atkinson Municipal Airport located north of Fort Atkinson. The Bureau had concerns about Alternative 5, but this alternative was not selected for further study in the DEIS.

b) District Office Real Estate Section

- ☐ **No - Coordination is not required because no inhabited houses or active businesses will be acquired.**
- ☒ **Yes - Coordination has been completed. Project effects and relocation assistance have been addressed. Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan attached as Appendix C.**

2) Interagency Coordination

In addition to NEPA, which requires an EIS, there are other Federal laws that require special permits and approvals from other State and Federal agencies. These agencies, called cooperating agencies, are given the opportunity to review and comment on the EIS prior to issuing permits or approvals. The USACE is a cooperating agency for this EIS.

To improve agency coordination, for this project, WisDOT and FHWA are following the *“Concurrent NEPA/404 Process for Transportation Projects”*, a process that gives the agencies the opportunity to review the DEIS at various pre-defined steps during its preparation. This is in anticipation that any major issues can be identified and addressed up-front rather than after the DEIS is completed and distributed to the public.

There are three distinct points in the DEIS process where the various Federal and State agencies are consulted and pre-consultation meetings are held.

1. Definition of purpose and need
2. Selection of alternatives to be carried forward for detailed study in the DEIS
3. Selection of a preferred alternative

The agencies concurred at each point prior to proceeding to the next step, which encouraged substantive participation by each agency. Concurrence at any point in the process did not mean that the project must be built or that a permit would be issued, rather it meant that the information developed was adequate to agree that the project could be advanced to the next stage of the NEPA process. Letters from the agencies are included in Appendix B.

One goal of agency coordination is to provide early identification of environmental resources and agency issues at a sufficient level of detail to develop a quality EIS that addresses the needs of the agencies and that adequately addresses the environmental impacts associated with the various alternatives under consideration. The following table summarizes agency coordination that has occurred so far for this DEIS.

Table 38: Federal and State Agency Coordination

State Agency	Coordination Attached?	Comments
Agriculture DATCP	See Appendix B	Participated in Section 404 Permit Merger pre-consultation meetings
Natural DNR Resources	See Appendix B	Participated in Section 404 Permit Merger pre-consultation meetings
Wisconsin Historical Society	See Appendix B	Participated in Section 404 Permit Merger pre-consultation meetings
Federal Agency	Coordination Attached?	Comments
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation ACHP	No	The ACHP would not be consulted unless there is an adverse effect upon a national register property
US Army Corps of Engineers USACE	See Appendix B	The USACE is a cooperating agency and participated in Section 404 Permit Merger process pre-consultation meetings
Environmental Protection Agency EPA	See Appendix B	Participated in Section 404 Permit Merger process pre-consultation meetings
National Park Service NPS	See Appendix B	Was invited to participate in Section 404 Permit Merger process. Has not yet attended meetings
Natural Resource Conservation Service NRCS	See Appendix B	Coordination is ongoing. NRCS has provided soils information. A USDA Farmland Conversion Impact Rating form has been reviewed by NRCS. The form is in Appendix H.
US Coast Guard USCG	No	N/A
US Fish & Wildlife Service FWS:	See Appendix B	Was invited to participate in Section 404 Permit Merger process. See attached phone memo and letters.

B. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

1) Briefly summarize the status and results of public involvement. Briefly describe how the public involvement process complied with EO 12898 on Environmental Justice.

Appendix E contains copies of various public involvement media including newsletters. A list of meetings held on this project is included in Table 39 below. The public involvement process complied with EO 12898 as described in the Environmental Justice Factor Sheet on page 108.

Table 39: List of Public Meetings

Meeting Dates	Group	Topic
<i>Advisory Committee</i>		
11/21/2002	Advisory Committee (Made up of representatives from the City of Fort Atkinson, Town of Koshkonong, Rock County and Jefferson County).	Kick-off meeting, duties of advisory committee, schedule, project background
1/15/2003	Advisory Committee	Present broad range of alternatives
1/28/2003	Advisory Committee and Agencies	Bus tour site visit to locations of alternatives and of existing corridor
2/26/2003	Advisory Committee	Traffic study update, draft purpose and need statement, screening of alternatives
6/4/2003	Advisory Committee	Discussion of Public Informational Meeting and presentation of preliminary impacts for screening alternatives
9/17/2003	Advisory Committee	Review all alternatives
10/15/2003	Advisory Committee	Recommend alternatives to study in detail in Draft EIS
12/10/2003	Advisory Committee	Discuss Agency Coordination and public involvement
3/3/2004	Advisory Committee (The group was expanded at this time to include the Towns of Milton and Lima)	Discuss potential indirect impacts
2/26/2004	Advisory Committee	Update new members from Rock County, Lima and Milton on project status
10/20/2004	Advisory Committee	Summary of Draft EIS
<i>Public Informational Meetings</i>		
10/10/2002	General Public	Scoping Meeting
4/23/2003	General Public	Present the broad range of alternatives and solicit public comment
11/19/03	General Public	Present which alternatives will be studied further in the Draft EIS and solicit public comment
<i>Special Interest Groups</i>		
10/2/2002	Friends of Koshkonong Highway 12	Take comment on the alternatives
9/6/2002	Fort Atkinson Chamber of Commerce	Present project, take comments
<i>Commissions, Committees and Officials</i>		
9/5/2002	Tom Boguszewski, Rock Co. Public Works	Present project, take comments
9/5/2002	Phil Blazkowski, Rock Co. Planning	Present project, take comments
9/4/2002	John Wilmette, City Manager Fort Atkinson	Present project, take comments
9/5/2002	Jeff Haas, Jefferson Co. Public Works	Present project, take comments
9/11/2002	Chairman Paul Swart, Town of Koshkonong [In addition, reps. of Friends of Koshkonong and approx. 50 members of the public were present]	Present project, take comments
9/12/2002	Town of Koshkonong Town Board Meeting	Present project, take comments
3/4/2003	John Wilmette, City Manager Fort Atkinson; Jeff Woods, Public Works, Fort Atkinson	Present project, take comments
3/13/2003	Tom Boguszewski, Phil Blazkowski	Present project, take comments
3/13/2003	Jeff Haas, Jefferson Co.	Present project, take comments

Meeting Dates	Group	Topic
3/13/2003	Chairman Paul Swart, Town of Koshkonong	Present project, take comments
3/24/2003	April Little, Village of Cambridge Administrator	Present project, take comments regarding secondary impacts to Village
3/24/2003	Chairman Richard Linsley, Town of Fulton, project introduction/update	Present project, take comments
4/28/2003	Village of Cambridge Officials, project introduction/update	Present project, take comments
4/29/2003	Town of Milton officials, project introduction/update	Present project, take comments
6/10/2003	Village of Cambridge Officials, project update	Present project, take comments
9/19/2003	John Wilmette, Jeff Woods, project update	Present project, take comments
12/17/2003	John Wilmette, Jeff Woods, Sheldon Mielke, Fort Industrial Development Corporation	Present project, take comments
1/13/2004	Town of Lima Officials, project update	Present project, take comments
3/23/2004	Fort Atkinson Plan Commission, project update	Present project, take comments
<i>Neighborhood Groups</i>		
8/26/2004	Wolf's Mobile Home Park Residents	Potential relocations, project update, take comments
<i>Agencies</i>		
10/10/02	Cooperating Federal and State Agencies	Agency Scoping Meeting
1/28/03	Advisory Committee and Agencies	Bus tour site visit to locations of alternatives and of existing corridor
5/28/03	Cooperating Federal and State Agencies	Purpose and Need
4/3/03	DNR	Purpose and Need
7/23/03	DNR	Purpose and Need
9/25/03	Cooperating Federal and State Agencies	Alternatives to carry forward
11/14/03	DNR	Alternatives to carry forward
12/19/03	DNR	Data collection discussions
6/8/04	DNR	Project update
10/26/04	Federal Interagency Meeting	Project Information and Status
<i>Expert Panels for Secondary Impacts Study</i>		
4/08/04	City of Fort Atkinson, Jefferson County Economic Development Corporation, Fort Atkinson Area Chamber of Commerce, Fort Atkinson Industrial Development Corporation, US 12 Fort Atkinson EIS Advisory Committee member City representative.	Potential secondary impacts
4/14/04	Town of Koshkonong, Town Chair	Potential secondary impacts
4/21/04	Town of Lima, Town Chair	Potential secondary impacts
5/03/04	Rock County Planning	Potential secondary impacts
5/4/04	Phil Blazkowski, Rock County Planning	Potential secondary impacts
5/03/04	Town of Milton Board of Supervisors	Potential secondary impacts

a) Identify groups (e.g., elderly, handicapped), minority populations and low-income populations that participated in the public involvement process. This would include any organizations and special interest groups.

A neighborhood meeting was held on August 26, 2004 with residents of a mobile home park located on Twinkling Star Road, just off US 12, north of the US 12 Whitewater bypass. The residents living in the park are potentially low-income, although the data for the whole census tract of which it is a part, may not indicate such. No formal income survey was conducted. For all alternatives, except Alternative 3, the project would require acquisition 5 of the 14 mobile homes. Through communication with the park owner and with the Town of Koshkonong Clerk, the neighborhood was identified as low-income and potentially had elderly residents. Residents were notified of the meeting with a personal mailed invitation. At the meeting, WisDOT staff and their consultants were present to describe the project and the potential impacts to their mobile homes. Relocation brochures were also distributed. The response at the meeting was mixed with some residents wanting to be relocated with another afraid of losing the peaceful surroundings.

Another mobile home park is located at the eastern end of Alternative 3 southwest of the intersection of Rock County Highway N and County Road. This neighborhood was identified as having a high Hispanic population and

also possibly lower income. A neighborhood notice sent to the residents was translated into Spanish. The letter explained the project and invited them to comment on the project. None of the mobile homes in this park would need to be relocated as a result of Alternative 3.

Communications with these groups contained the following statement

“Environmental justice: Equity sought in transportation planning Public involvement is for absolutely everyone. WisDOT is committed to equity and fairness, and it wants to ensure that no one is excluded from the US 12 project decision-making process. Identifying and addressing disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority, low-income, disabled or elderly individuals will help achieve environmental justice and promote nondiscrimination in your community. If you know of anyone who may be impacted by this project and whose voice is not being heard, please contact WisDOT District 1 Project Manager Scott Simmons at (608) 246-5444. Luther Elementary School in Fort Atkinson, site of the Nov. 19 public information meeting, is wheelchair accessible. For more information or to place a request for assistance at the meeting, please call Simmons or the Wisconsin Telecommunications Relay System at (800) 947-3529”

b) Describe, briefly, the issues, if any, identified by any groups, minority populations and/or low-income populations during the public involvement process.

Public comments are summarized in the Comment Summary Section on page 175. Issues included purpose and need, design issues, safety, traffic, environmental justice, economics, tax revenue and property values, pedestrian and bicycles, residential and relocation impacts, agricultural impacts, wetland and habitat impacts, history and archaeology, aesthetic impacts, public involvement, and planning issues

No issues were identified by minority populations and/or low income populations of the mobile home parks. One comment was received that the mobile home park in Rock County was impacted by the US 12 Whitewater bypass and asked for full and fair participation for the lower income and minority communities. No comments were received from the mobile home park residents, who received a targeted mailing inviting their input. Most residents of the mobile home park in Jefferson County, who attended the neighborhood meeting, indicated that they would like to be relocated away from the mobile home park.

c) Briefly describe how the issues identified above were addressed. Include a discussion of those that were avoided as well as those that were minimized and those that are to be mitigated. Include a brief discussion of proposed mitigation, if any.

The issues identified in item b) above, were considered in the development of the purpose and need statement, the alternatives analysis and the design of the various alternatives. Other issues cited above are addressed in the factor sheets.

2) Briefly describe the results of coordination with local units of government.

Through coordination with the local governments of the City of Fort Atkinson and the surrounding townships, alternatives were developed and refined based upon issues identified by the various government entities. Coordination and the local government-identified issues are summarized in

Table 40.

a) Identify local units of government contacted and provide the date coordination was initiated.

Local units of government were coordinated with on an ongoing basis. WisDOT met with representatives of the local government or with the elected officials. Specific meetings were held as stated in the following table, and include individual meetings with staff as well as public meetings in front of the representative bodies.

An Advisory Committee was formed and 10 meetings were held. Representation on the Advisory Committee included the Town of Koshkonong, Jefferson County, Rock County, and the City of Fort Atkinson. The Towns of Lima and Milton were added later after a Rock County alternative (Alternative 3) was selected for detailed study. See page 183 for a list of Advisory Committee members.

Table 40: Coordination with Local Units of Government

Government	Dates of coordination	Issues identified
City of Fort Atkinson	9/4/02, 10/10/02, 3/4/03, 9/19/03, 12/17/03	Need for access to City's Industrial Park Need to reroute regional and through-traffic out of Fort Atkinson Need to make Fort Atkinson a place to go to, not through Need to have a pedestrian friendly downtown Need to provide safer access to homes along US 12 in the City
Jefferson County	9/5/02, 3/13/03	Need a strong public involvement process US 12 needs to be functional
Rock County	9/5/02, 3/13/03, 5/3/04	Not initially opposed to using N corridor Did not think that Alternative 3 was practicable The alternatives closer to Fort Atkinson made more sense
Walworth County	04/03	Need to also improve US 12 in Walworth County from east of Whitewater Bypass, closing the gap between Whitewater and Elkhorn.
Town of Koshkonong, Jefferson County	9/11/02, 3/13/03, 4/14/04	Loss of agricultural soil resources Impacts to farmsteads A bypass may encourage urban growth on the fringes of Fort Atkinson Impacts to residences and commercial homes Impacts to natural resources, especially wetlands and habitat Not interested in a jurisdictional transfer of Town roads for any bypass alternatives
Town of Lima, Rock County	1/13/03, 4/21/04	Need for public involvement for Rock County Concern for historic farmsteads Concern for loss of access to farms.
Town of Milton, Rock County	4/29/03, 5/3/04	Need for public involvement for Rock County Concern for historic farmsteads Concern for loss of access to farms.
Village of Cambridge	6/10/03, 4/28/03, 3/24/03	Concern for future need to bypass Cambridge as a secondary effect.

b) Describe, briefly, the issues, if any, identified by local units of government during the public involvement process.

See

Table 40, for the issues identified by local units of government. The following resolutions were adopted by Rock County, the Towns of Koshkonong, Milton and Lima and the City of Fort Atkinson.

See Appendix F for copies of these Resolutions.

Table 41: Locally Adopted Resolutions Regarding US 12

Resolution #	Government	Issues Identified
1-9-02	Town of Koshkonong	Town does not support a bypass of US 12 around Fort Atkinson, rather reconditioning and reconstruction of US 12 and the provision of a truck route around the downtown. Resolution suggested that TSM improvements should be analyzed and the use of existing street and highways for alternative routes.
1017	Fort Atkinson City Council	Supports the needs study and eventual construction of a US 12 bypass of Fort Atkinson.
48-09/02	Walworth County	Resolution requesting the Wisconsin Department of Transportation to advance planning and construction of the realignment of US Highway 12 between Elkhorn and Whitewater in order to preserve the future highway corridor from development pressures.
72-11/02	Walworth County	Supporting the original US 12 corridor between Elkhorn and Whitewater.
11-13-02	Town of Koshkonong	Resolution to proposed rerouting of US 12 along route of CTH N from Whitewater to intersection with Highway 26 and continue on the Newville where it will join with Interstate 90.
3/20/03	Fort Atkinson Industrial Development Corporation	Opposition to US 12 bypass Option 2 (the original through-city route)
3/18/03	Fort Atkinson Chamber of Commerce	Opposition to US 12 bypass Option 2 (the original through-city route)
12/03	Town of Lima	Resolution expressing opposition to US Highway 12 bypass Alternative 3: WIS 26 and Rock County N.
011204	Rock County	Resolution expressing opposition to US Highway 12 bypass Alternative 3: WIS 26 & Rock County Trunk Hwy N.

c) Briefly describe how the issues identified above were addressed. Include a discussion of those that were avoided as well as those that were minimized and those that are to be mitigated. Include a brief discussion of proposed mitigation, if any.

When a preferred alternative is selected the issues associated with that alternative would be addressed through avoidance, minimization and if necessary, mitigation. The Environmental Commitments section of this document on page 164 lists commitments that would be applied to this project (NOTE: Environmental Commitments are not listed in the DEIS; commitments would be developed for the preferred alternative and included in the FEIS.)

C. COMMENT SUMMARY

Comments sheets were distributed at each Public Information Meeting and a large number of written comments were received by WisDOT for each meeting. These comments were read and examined in detail and summarized for review of the project team and agencies upon request. Many of the comments were regarding similar issues. They have been further summarized to the following key issues. The EIS Factor Sheets and Basic Sheets analyze all the issues in detail. The chief issues of concern are presented below.

The written response was exceptionally voluminous and so comments have been summarized into the following categories. Individual comments are on file.

Purpose and Need

(See Purpose and Need Statement in the Basic Sheets)

Some area residents have stated that they do not feel there is a need to improve the highway and that it wastes taxpayers' money. Some felt that US 12 should be left as is or remain on the existing alignment to avoid the environmental impacts associated with a bypass. Several people wanted to see what will happen with the recent and upcoming improvements along Madison Avenue and along US 12 between Cambridge and Fort Atkinson and between Whitewater and Fort Atkinson before committing to new roads. They asked to exhaust the various upgrades and improvements first.

Others commented that Fort Atkinson needs to fix their own roads and then there would be fewer problems for US 12 through Fort Atkinson. Many commenters felt that it is Fort's problem and that Fort should fix it themselves. Many felt that a third bridge would solve the downtown traffic issue.

Still others have expressed the opposite sentiment, that the existing traffic, noise and congestion conditions in downtown Fort Atkinson warrant improvements. Residents within Fort Atkinson have expressed concerns with the increasing traffic flow on US 12 citing difficulties getting in and out of their driveways. Cited also were existing problems with noise, air pollution, dust and debris, a "constant flow of traffic", traffic exceeding the speed limit, noise from semi-trucks making it impossible to carry on a conversation and shaking the houses. Declining property values were cited as another existing problem in Fort Atkinson to be blamed on existing conditions on US 12.

At the initial public information meetings, several commenters felt that Alternative 3a (redirect US 12 traffic to the interstate along CTH N) would save money, would take the people traveling through to Madison out of Fort Atkinson and would avoid the need to bypass Cambridge in the future and would avoid "passing off" a possible "dilemma" to Cambridge.

Design Issues

(See Summary of the Alternatives in the Basic Sheets)

A few people made suggestions for designing the various alternatives including the need to widen US 12. Other suggestions included taking the shortest bypass route to save money and resources, improving the intersections, and adding an alternate truck route in Fort Atkinson. One commenter suggested routing WIS 89 along the Alternative 7 bypass as well as 12. Another comment was that they need system interchanges because US 12 should not be made to stop to make turns. Alternative 3 is too long and out of the way.

Many other detailed suggestions for design needs on the bypass alternatives were made.

Safety

(See Purpose and Need Statement and the Summary of the Alternatives in the Basic Sheets as well as the General Economic, Community or Residential Impact Evaluation, and the Economic Development and Business Impact Evaluation Factor Sheets)

Concern was expressed for existing safety problems along US 12 as well as future safety problems on CTH N, if Alternative 3 was chosen. Several comments were received that a bypass would be the best solution for safety problems in Fort Atkinson by reducing truck traffic and through traffic.

A number of comments were received that were concerned about leaving US 12 on its current alignment because of the danger for elementary and middle school students in crossing US 12.

The public has expressed safety concerns with the curve on US 12 between Smiley Lane and Cheesebror Road, having had two fatalities in approximately the past year near that location.

Traffic Impacts

(See Purpose and Need Statement and the Traffic Summary in the Basic Sheets)

Area residents cited concern for the traffic type or amount through downtown Fort Atkinson. The effectiveness of Alternative 3 was questioned in terms of the amount of traffic that would utilize it. Some felt that they had not encountered enough traffic to warrant a bypass. The No action alternative was opposed because its capacity would be reached by 2030. The through-city alternatives were cited as doing nothing for inter-regional traffic. Alternative 3 was cited as being too long to serve traffic. There were questions regarding the validity of the O-D study and the traffic studies. There was a comment that a bypass would increase traffic dramatically along the entire US 12 corridor. Regarding large trucks, one commenter pointed out that there are two trucking firms in Fort Atkinson that probably account for a large percentage of the large trucks counted.

Some people commented that with a bypass, roads would be shut off and people would not be able to get where they want to go in a short time.

Many people commented that a bypass such as Alternative 7 or 7a would be most effective for managing traffic flow through the region. Several comments were received in favor of a bypass because it would be a most direct and convenient route, would keep large trucks out of the city, would be best at managing flow from Whitewater to Cambridge. A bypass would provide access to Fort Atkinson's business park. It is a logical choice and would better serve intra- and inter-regional traffic.

Alternative 7 is the best long term solution.

Many stated that they felt Alternative 3 takes traffic too far away from Fort Atkinson.

Semi-trucks must make numerous turns to navigate the existing route and often utilize two lanes to make the turns.

The counts on the bridges will or are at the levels that established the need for the Highway 26 bypass

One commenter noted that Alternative 3 is not a good idea because it is already used de facto by truckers.

Alternative 3 is too close and parallel to WIS 59 and so is redundant.

Environmental Justice

(See Environmental Justice Factor Sheets. Also most of the Factor Sheets have questions related to Environmental Justice)

One commenter indicated that a trailer park along N was largely Hispanic and was already negatively impacted by the soon to be completed US 12 Whitewater bypass. She called for full and fair participation for the lower income and minority communities.

Economic Impacts

(See General Economics Impact Evaluation, Community or Residential Impact Evaluation, and the Economic Development and Business Impact Evaluation Factor Sheets)

Business interests in downtown Fort Atkinson expressed concern that Alternatives 1, 1a, 2 and 2b, which leave US 12 in downtown Fort Atkinson would degrade the quality of life downtown and would detract from their goals to provide a destination for shoppers. Many commented how the existing heavy truck traffic downtown makes it difficult for pedestrians and so discourages them from shopping. Another commenter felt that putting a bypass around Fort Atkinson would kill the business downtown. Many commenters reacted to Alternative 2 (widening the existing route) citing enormous impacts to the building in the central business district.

The Industrial Development Corporation has indicated a need for a bypass to realize their plans to provide access to their business park on the south side of Fort Atkinson.

Area farmers expressed concern with the potential loss of or impacts to their farm businesses as a result of the bypass alternatives.

Many commenters wanted to compare the costs of the various alternatives and choose the most cost effective alternative. Many people compared the costs and benefits of the various alternatives to come to their recommendation on the best alternative. Many were concerned with the cost of a bypass and the effects on the state budget. Some felt it would be a waste of money to build and maintain a bypass. Others cited the cost of road building and its effect on already high taxes in Wisconsin. Some commenters felt that the bypass alternatives would be more cost effective. One commenter suggested that DOT should upgrade what they have and use the cost savings to enforce speed controls.

Tax Revenue and Property Value Impacts

(See General Economics Impact Evaluation, and Community or Residential Impact Evaluation Factor Sheets)

Comments regarding the potential loss of tax revenue from conversion of private lands to public ownership were heard for all alternatives that take right-of-way.

Comments were received that indicated a fear for loss of property value to those homes near Alternatives 7, 7a and 3. One commenter stated that with Alternatives 7 and 7a there would be a loss of development potential to the town as well as additional costs for the Town in terms of fire and ambulance services, costs of road and infrastructure damage due to construction, and loss of shared revenue.

One person felt that the city or DOT should compensate the Towns for their losses incurred with a bypass.

Another area resident felt that the town of Lima has a disproportionate impact on tax revenues due to their smaller population. The rest of the taxpayers in the Township would have to make up for the loss of property taxes.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Impacts

(See Purpose and Need Statement, Summary of Alternatives and Compatibility with Adopted Plans in the Basic Sheets. See also the General Economics Impact Evaluation, Economic Development and Business Impact Evaluation, Community or Residential Impact Evaluation and the Aesthetics Factor Sheets)

Comments were submitted that the downtown is congested and that the route goes through residential neighborhoods where there is a lot of pedestrian traffic, which will be a concern when the west end of the Riverwalk and the relocated Lorman Bicentennial Park are located at the Robert Street Bridge.

Again, some people were concerned for pedestrian safety for school children citing that there are a lot of children crossing Whitewater Avenue to go to school at Purdy Elementary School and the Jr. High.

One bicycle advocate thought that Alternative 3 would disrupt bike races on sections of N and would negatively impact the ability of cyclists to use the area.

Residential and Relocation Impacts

(See Community or Residential Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet)

Potentially affected residents have expressed concern over the potential loss of their homes as a result of highway widening. Many commenters reacted to Alternative 2 (widening the existing route) citing the impacts to the houses. Commenters living along Rock County N expressed concerns with the impacts on the homes along CTH N if Alternative 3 was chosen.

One commenter felt that those living along US 12 should have to deal with road improvements rather than those in the Town of Koshkonong.

Some people felt that Alternative 7 would help make school zones safer and make the residential areas quieter and make motorists happier.

Agricultural Impacts

(See Agricultural Impact Evaluation Factor Sheet)

Area farmers and local officials from the Town of Koshkonong have expressed concern over the irreplaceable loss of agricultural lands as a result of Alternatives 3, 7, and 7a. The concern is that productive agricultural lands would be taken out of production, there would be economic hardships on the affected farmers, their lands would be severed or buildings lost, there would in general be a disruption to their farm operations and to water flow over the sites. Also the loss would destroy the fundamental character and beauty of the area as well as farming legacies that have persisted over decades and through multiple generations. Alternatives 7 and 7a would affect large tracts of land. Also cited was concern for farmer safety as they travel from field to field on Alternative 3's CTH N.

Wetland and Habitat Impacts

(See Wetlands Impact Evaluation, Streams and Floodplains Impact Evaluation, and Upland Habitat Impact Evaluation Factor Sheets)

Area residents have expressed concern over the potential impacts of Alternative 7 and 7a on the Allen Creek wetlands and floodplains. Allen Creek is the only listed exceptional surface water resource in Jefferson County. The wetlands are very high quality, intact ecosystems including calcareous fen and sedge meadow.

There is concern about impacts of Alternative 7 and 7a to the habitat for rare, threatened and endangered species of plants, animals and insects as well as the loss of rural character associated with these undeveloped areas. There was also concern for the wetlands and habitat on Alternative 3.

A couple of people expressed their concern for loss of hunting lands and that a bypass would impact a "troubled deer population", turkeys, cranes and pheasant. It was also indicated that at least one hunt club would be impacted.

History and Archaeology

(See Historic Structures/Buildings Impact Evaluation and Archaeological Sites Impact Evaluation Factor Sheets)

A few comments noted that a bypass could impact cultural resources: there are a lot of historic homes along US 12 that could be impacted with a through-city route; and there are several historic farms and houses along CTH N that could be impacted by Alternative 3.

Aesthetic Impacts

(See Aesthetics Factor Sheet)

Many commenters expressed the desire to preserve the rural character of the countryside including agricultural lands and wetlands and woodlands. Some noted that Alternative 7a will destroy a state designated Rustic Road.

Public Involvement

(See Public Involvement in the Comments and Coordination Section)

A few comments were received about needing more public involvement. Others stated that they felt that any selected alternative should be based on public input and public support and that political “game-playing” should be kept out of the community. One commentor stated that there was no public support expressed for a bypass at the Public Information Meetings.

A few commenters stated they felt that DOT has a “predetermined” route that is Alternative 7 and that the meetings were “choreographed lip-service”.

Many residents along CTH N in Rock County were dismayed that Alternative 3 was proposed and indicated that they did not take it seriously and so did not attend the first Public Information meetings.

One commenter thought that it would be wrong to assume a simple head count of attendees at a PIM would reflect a majority opinion and that a majority of area residents would prefer that this matter be resolved by experts rather than via the “town-meeting” method. If we need to do an “every voice” kind of determination, then it should be done via a regional referendum.

Many area residents expressed concern that there was a vocal minority opinion being expressed in favor of Alternative 3.

Planning Issues

(See Compatibility with Adopted Plans in the Basic Sheets)

Some area residents had comments about land use and planning issues.

Some felt that Alternative 7 is most compatible with the goals established by the City of Fort Atkinson Master Plan. Another thought Alternative 7 would be too close to the city and would create problems with their future expansion. Still another thought a bypass would cause urban sprawl. On the other hand, one commenter felt that the bypasses would not be compatible with the Jefferson County Land Use policies that encourage development to be located in areas that are environmentally suitable and preserve areas that possess valuable natural resource characteristics or are environmentally sensitive.

Many commenters from the Rock county area did not understand the logic behind using CTH N in that it would be ineffective and not viable because it is indirect, long and out of the way.

One person argued that no companies would alter their location decision based on whether Highway 12 ran along Alternatives 7 and 7a or Alternative 3 since the park still has access to 26.

D. LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PERSONS TO WHOM COPIES OF THE STATEMENT WERE SENT

Agencies, Organizations and Persons	Names	Commented on DEIS*	Rec'd Copy of FEIS*
Federal Agencies			
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Review Branch (Chicago)	Sherry Kamke, EIS Coordinator, Environmental Scientist		
U.S. Dept. of Transportation – Federal Highway Administration (Madison)	Johnny Gerbitz Jackie Lawton		
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Tamara Cameron, St. Paul Daryl Wierzbinski, Milwaukee		
U.S. Dept. of Interior	Office of Environmental Project Review		
U.S. Dept. of Interior	Bureau of Indian Affairs		
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture NRCS Office-Madison	Patricia Leavensorth		
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Green Bay)	Janet Smith		
National Center for Environmental Health & Injury Control	Kenneth W. Holt		
U.S. Housing & Urban Development (Milwaukee)			
U.S. Housing & Urban Development (Chicago)			
U.S. Department of Commerce			
State Agencies			
Department of Administration	Div. of Energy and Intergovernmental Relations		
Bureau of Aeronautics	Gary Dikkers, Airspace Manager		
Department of Natural Resources (4 copies)	Signe L. Holtz Catherine Bleser Russ Anderson		
Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection	Peter Nauth, Agricultural Impact Analyst		
State Historic Preservation Office	Michael E. Stevens		
Legislative Fiscal Bureau	Vicki Holton		
WisDOT Library			
Libraries			
Dwight Foster Library – Fort Atkinson			
Jefferson Library – Jefferson			
Whitewater Public Library/ Irvin L. Young Memorial Library – Whitewater			
Cambridge Village Library – Cambridge			
Janesville Library			
Milton Public Library – Milton			
Elected Officials			
U.S. Senate	Senator Russell Feingold		
U.S. Senate	Senator Herbert Kohl		
2nd U.S. Congressional District	Representative Tammy Baldwin		
1st U.S. Congressional District	Representative Paul Ryan		
5th U.S. Congressional District	Representative F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.		
6th U.S. Congressional District	Representative Tom Petri		
State of Wisconsin Governor	Jim Doyle		
State Senate District 11	Neal Kedzie		
State Senate District 13	Scott Fitzgerald		
State Senate District 15	Judith Robson		
State Assembly District 31	Stephen Nass		
State Assembly District 37	David Ward		
State Assembly District 38	Joel Kleefisch		
State Assembly District 43	Debi Towns		
Local Organizations			
Friends of Koshkonong	Jerry Mortimer		
Concerned Citizens of Lima	Joanne Kyle		
Fort Atkinson Chamber of Commerce	Diane Hrobsky		
Fort Atkinson Industrial Development Corporation	Sheldon Mielke		
Hoard Museum (Fort Atkinson Historical Society)	Sue Hartwick		
Rock County Historical Society	Melissa de Bie		

Agencies, Organizations and Persons	Names	Commented on DEIS*	Rec'd Copy of FEIS*
Advisory Committee members	See page 183 for a list of members		
Local Unit(s) of Government			
Town of Koshkonong	Rhonda Cook		
Town of Jefferson			
City of Fort Atkinson	John Wilmet		
Jefferson County	Barbara A. Frank, Clerk		
Rock County	Rochard Ott		
Walworth County			
Town of Milton	Jeannine Schrank		
Town of Lima			
Interested Groups and Citizens			
Sierra Club			
1000 Friends of Wisconsin			
Ho Chunk Nation			
Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin			
Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians (Tribal Historic Preservation)			
Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation (Government Center)			
Citizens Requesting Copies			
As requested**			

* To be filled out after circulation of the DEIS

** There may be a charge for this service

E. ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

An Advisory Committee was formed to provide guidance and local input. Members included the following.

Jefferson County Board

Supervisor Tim Griep
County Board Supervisor District 30

Jefferson County Board

Supervisor Carlton Zentner
County Board Supervisor District 26

Town of Koshkonong Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Jae Ames
Town of Koshkonong Supervisor III

Friends of Koshkonong US 12 Committee

Mr. Todd Carter

Town of Koshkonong Resident

Mr. Mark Anderson

City of Fort Atkinson

Council member Bill Camplin
Fort Atkinson City Council

Fort Atkinson Resident

Mr. Chuck Frandson

Greater Fort Atkinson Chamber of Commerce

Mr. David Schulz

Rock County Board

Supervisor Mary Mawhinney
District #4 Supervisor

Ms. Jacquelin Wood (former member)
County Board Supervisor District 24; Planning &
Development Committee

Town of Lima Resident

Michael Newell

Town of Lima, Concerned Citizens of Lima

Joanne Kyle

Town of Milton Board of Supervisors

Supervisor Leonard Stalker

Town of Milton Resident

Mr. Robert Hanlon

Staff

Michelle Ellias
WisDOT District 1 Headquarters
Project Manager

Scott D. Simmons - DOT
WisDOT District 1 Headquarters

Matt Hintze
HNTB Corporation
Consultant Project Manager